

## Set Theory (MATH 6730)

### Trees

From now on we will work in ZFC.

**Definition 1.** A *tree* is a partially ordered set  $(T, <)$  with the property that for every  $t \in T$  the set  $\{s \in T : s < t\}$  is well-ordered by  $<$ . If  $(T, <)$  is a tree,

- the *height* of an element  $t \in T$  is the order type of the set  $\{s \in T : s < t\}$  (a uniquely determined ordinal), and is denoted by  $\text{ht}(t, T)$  or  $\text{ht}(t)$ ;
- the *height* of  $T$ , denoted by  $\text{ht}(T)$ , is the least ordinal greater than all ordinals  $\text{ht}(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ ;
- an element of  $T$  of height 0 is called a *root* of  $T$ ;
- for each ordinal  $\alpha$ , the  $\alpha$ -th *level* of  $T$ , denoted by  $\text{Lev}_\alpha(T)$ , is the set of all elements of  $T$  of height  $\alpha$ ;
- a *chain* in  $T$  is a subset of  $T$  linearly ordered (hence well-ordered) by  $<$ ;
- the *length of a chain*  $C$  in  $T$  is the order type of  $C$  (a uniquely determined ordinal);
- a *branch* of  $T$  is a maximal chain in  $T$ ;
- an *antichain* in  $T$  is a subset  $X$  of  $T$  such that any two distinct elements of  $X$  are incomparable.

**Notation 2.** For any tree  $(T, <)$  and  $t \in T$  we will denote the set  $\{u \in T : t \leq u\}$  by  $\text{Up}(t, T)$  or simply  $\text{Up}(t)$ .

**Notation 3.** For any ordinal  $\alpha$  and any set  $S$ , let  ${}^{<\alpha}S$  denote the set of all functions  $\beta \rightarrow S$  such that  $\beta < \alpha$ . Equivalently,

$${}^{<\alpha}S = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} {}^\beta S = \{\langle s_\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle : \beta < \alpha, s_\gamma \in S \text{ for all } \gamma < \beta\}.$$

**Example 4.**

- $(\alpha, <)$  is a tree for every ordinal; its height is  $\alpha$ ; it has a unique branch, namely  $\alpha$  itself, and the length of the branch is also  $\alpha$ .
- $({}^{<\alpha}2, \subset)$  is a tree for every ordinal  $\alpha$ <sup>1</sup>; its height is  $\alpha$ , and every branch has length  $\alpha$ .
- $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$  is not a tree.
- The level sets of a tree are antichains in the tree.

**Theorem 5.** (König's Tree Lemma) *Every tree of height  $\omega$  in which all levels are finite has an infinite branch.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout,  $\subset$  denotes proper inclusion.

**Definition 6.** Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. A tree is called

- a  $\kappa$ -tree if it has height  $\kappa$  and every level has size  $< \kappa$ ;
- a  $\kappa$ -Aronszajn tree if it is a  $\kappa$ -tree and has no chain of size  $\kappa$ ;
- a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree if it has height  $\kappa$  and has no chains or antichains of size  $\kappa$ .

An Aronszajn tree is an  $\omega_1$ -Aronszajn tree, while a Suslin tree is an  $\omega_1$ -Suslin tree.

**Facts 7.**

- (i) König's Theorem is equivalent to saying that there is no  $\omega$ -Aronszajn tree.
- (ii) For any infinite cardinal  $\kappa$  and for any tree  $(T, <)$ ,

$$T \text{ is a } \kappa\text{-Suslin tree} \Rightarrow T \text{ is a } \kappa\text{-Aronszajn tree} \Rightarrow T \text{ is a } \kappa\text{-tree.}$$

**Theorem 8.** If  $\kappa$  is a singular cardinal, then there exists a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree.

*Proof.* Since  $\kappa$  is singular, there exists a strictly increasing sequence  $\langle \lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$  of cardinals such that  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \text{cf}(\kappa)} \lambda_\alpha = \kappa$ . Consider the tree with a single root  $r$  which is the union of 'almost disjoint' branches  $B_\alpha$  of lengths  $\lambda_\alpha$  ( $\alpha < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ ), that is,  $B_\alpha \cap B_\beta = \{r\}$  for all  $\alpha < \beta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ . □

There are no results in ZFC about the existence or nonexistence of  $\kappa$ -Suslin trees for uncountable regular cardinals  $\kappa$ . In particular, for  $\kappa = \omega_1$  it is known that the existence of a Suslin tree is independent of ZFC.

However, for Aronszajn trees, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 9.** *There exists an Aronszajn tree.*

*Proof.* The desired tree will be constructed as a subtree of  $(T, \subset)$  where

$$T = \{s \in {}^{<\omega_1}\omega : s \text{ is one-to-one}\}.$$

We will define the system  $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$  of levels of the desired tree by recursion so that the following conditions are satisfied for each  $\beta < \omega_1$ :

- (1 $_\beta$ )  $S_\beta \subseteq {}^\beta\omega \cap T$ .
- (2 $_\beta$ )  $\omega \setminus \text{rng}(s)$  is infinite for every  $s \in S_\beta$ .
- (3 $_\beta$ ) For all  $s \in S_\gamma$  with  $\gamma < \beta$  there exists  $t \in S_\beta$  such that  $s \subset t$ .
- (4 $_\beta$ )  $|S_\beta| \leq \omega$ .
- (5 $_\beta$ ) If  $s \in S_\beta$  and  $t \in {}^\beta\omega \cap T$  are such that  $\{\gamma < \beta : s(\gamma) \neq t(\gamma)\}$  is finite, then  $t \in S_\beta$ .
- (6 $_\beta$ ) If  $s \in S_\beta$  and  $\gamma < \beta$ , then  $s \upharpoonright \gamma \in S_\gamma$ .

If this can be achieved, then the tree  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} S_\alpha, \subset)$  is an Aronszajn tree. (Why?)

Let  $\alpha$  be an ordinal  $< \omega_1$ . For  $\alpha = 0$ , let  $S_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ . Clearly, conditions (1 $_0$ )–(6 $_0$ ) hold.

Now let  $\alpha > 0$ , and assume that the system  $\langle S_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$  of levels has been defined so that conditions (1 $_\beta$ )–(6 $_\beta$ ) hold for all  $\beta < \alpha$ . Our goal is to define  $S_\alpha$  so that conditions (1 $_\alpha$ )–(6 $_\alpha$ ) hold.

First, let  $\alpha (< \omega_1)$  be a successor ordinal, say  $\alpha = \varepsilon + 1$ . Define  $S_\alpha$  to be the set of all  $t \in {}^\alpha\omega \cap T$  that extend members of  $S_\varepsilon$ ; that is,

$$S_\alpha = \{s \cup \{(\varepsilon, n)\} : s \in S_\varepsilon, n \in \omega \setminus \text{rng}(s)\}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that conditions (1 $_\alpha$ )–(6 $_\alpha$ ) are satisfied.

- (1<sub>β</sub>)  $S_\beta \subseteq {}^\beta\omega \cap T$ .
- (2<sub>β</sub>)  $\omega \setminus \text{rng}(s)$  is infinite for every  $s \in S_\beta$ .
- (3<sub>β</sub>) For all  $s \in S_\gamma$  with  $\gamma < \beta$  there exists  $t \in S_\beta$  such that  $s \subset t$ .
- (4<sub>β</sub>)  $|S_\beta| \leq \omega$ .
- (5<sub>β</sub>) If  $s \in S_\beta$  and  $t \in {}^\beta\omega \cap T$  are such that  $\{\gamma < \beta : s(\gamma) \neq t(\gamma)\}$  is finite, then  $t \in S_\beta$ .
- (6<sub>β</sub>) If  $s \in S_\beta$  and  $\gamma < \beta$ , then  $s \upharpoonright \gamma \in S_\gamma$ .

Now let  $\alpha (< \omega_1)$  be a limit ordinal. Since  $\alpha$  is countable, we have  $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$ . Hence, there exists a strictly increasing sequence  $\langle \delta_n : n \in \omega \rangle$  of ordinals such that  $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} \delta_n = \alpha$ . Choose and fix such a sequence. Let  $U = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} S_\beta$ . Given any  $s \in U$ , say  $\text{dmn}(s) = \beta$ , we want to define an extension  $t_s \in {}^\alpha\omega \cap T$  of  $s$  such that  $\omega \setminus \text{rng}(t_s)$  is infinite. The steps are as follows:

- Let  $n \in \omega$  be minimal with  $\beta \leq \delta_n$ . Use (3) <sub>$\delta_{n+i}$</sub>  for  $i \in \omega$  to define a sequence  $\langle u_i : i \in \omega \rangle$  by recursion such that  $s \subseteq u_0$ ,  $u_i \in S_{\delta_{n+i}}$ , and  $u_i \subset u_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in \omega$ .
- $v = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} u_i$  satisfies  $s \subseteq v \in {}^\alpha\omega \cap T$ , but it may fail that  $\omega \setminus \text{rng}(v)$  is infinite.
- Modify  $v$  at all places  $\delta_{n+i}$  ( $i \in \omega$ ) to get  $t_s$ .

Define  $S_\alpha$  by

$$S_\alpha = \bigcup_{s \in U} \{w \in {}^\alpha\omega \cap T : \{\varepsilon < \alpha : w(\varepsilon) \neq t_s(\varepsilon)\} \text{ is finite}\},$$

and check that conditions (1<sub>α</sub>)–(6<sub>α</sub>) are satisfied. □

**Remark 10.** The Aronszajn tree  $(S, \subset) = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} S_\alpha, \subset)$  constructed in the proof of Theorem 9 is not a Suslin tree, because the sets

$$A_n = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} \{s \in S_{\alpha+1} : s(\alpha) = n\} \quad (n \in \omega)$$

are antichains in  $(S, \subset)$ , but since  $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} S_{\alpha+1}$  and  $|\bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} S_{\alpha+1}| = \omega_1$ , we get that at least one of the antichains  $A_n$  ( $n \in \omega$ ) has cardinality  $\omega_1$ .

For the rest of this section we will focus on Suslin trees. Our main objectives are

- (I) to establish a sufficient condition for a  $\kappa$ -tree ( $\kappa$  uncountable regular) to be a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree, which we will use later on in the course to prove the existence of a Suslin tree under an extra assumption added to ZFC;
- (II) to discuss the relationship between Suslin trees and Suslin lines, which motivates the study of Suslin trees.

We need some preparation.

**Definition 11.** Let  $(T, <)$  be a tree, and let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal.

- We say that  $T$  is *eventually branching* if for every  $t \in T$  the set  $\text{Up}(t)$  is not a chain in  $T$ .
- A *normal subtree* of  $(T, <)$  is a tree  $(S, \prec)$  such that
  - $(S, \prec)$  is a *subtree* of  $(T, <)$ , that is,  $S \subseteq T$  and  $\prec = < \cap (S \times S)$ ; and
  - for any  $t, t' \in T$ , if  $t < t'$  and  $t' \in S$ , then  $t \in S$ .
- $T$  is called a *well-pruned  $\kappa$ -tree* if
  - $T$  is a  $\kappa$ -tree with exactly one root, and
  - for all  $\alpha < \beta < \text{ht}(T)$  and for every  $x \in \text{Lev}_\alpha(T)$  there exists  $y \in \text{Lev}_\beta(T)$  such that  $x < y$ .

**Example 12.** The Aronszajn tree  $(S, \subset) = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} S_\alpha, \subset)$  constructed in the proof of Theorem 9 is

- a normal subtree of  $(T, \subset)$  where  $T = \{s \in {}^{<\omega_1}\omega : s \text{ is one-to-one}\}$ ; and is
- an eventually branching, well-pruned  $\omega_1$ -tree.

**Facts 13.** Let  $T$  be a tree, and let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal.

- (i) If  $S$  is a normal subtree of  $T$ , then  $\text{ht}(s, T) = \text{ht}(s, S)$  for all  $s \in S$ .
- (ii) A normal subtree of height  $\kappa$  of a  $\kappa$ -Aronszajn tree is a  $\kappa$ -Aronszajn tree; a normal subtree of height  $\kappa$  of a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree is a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree.
- (iii) A well-pruned  $\kappa$ -Aronszajn tree is eventually branching.

**Theorem 14.** *Let  $\kappa$  be a regular cardinal, and let  $T$  be an arbitrary  $\kappa$ -tree.*

- (i)  *$T$  has a normal subtree  $T'$  which is a well-pruned  $\kappa$ -tree.*
- (ii) *Moreover, if  $x \in T$  is such that  $|\text{Up}(x)| = \kappa$ , then  $T$  has a normal subtree  $T'$  containing  $x$  which is a well-pruned  $\kappa$ -tree.*

*Idea of Proof.* Argue that

- Under the assumptions of (i),  $T$  has a root  $r$  such that  $|\text{Up}(r)| = \kappa$ .  
Under the assumptions of (ii),  $T$  has a root  $r \leq x$  such that  $|\text{Up}(r)| = \kappa$ .
- The (normal!) subtree  $T'$  of  $T$  defined by  $T' = \{t \in T : r \leq t, |\text{Up}(t)| = \kappa\}$  is a well-pruned  $\kappa$ -tree. □

**Theorem 15.** *Let  $\kappa$  be an uncountable regular cardinal. If  $T$  is an eventually branching  $\kappa$ -tree such that every antichain in  $T$  has size  $< \kappa$ , then  $T$  is a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree.*

*Idea of Proof.* Arguing the contrapositive, we consider any eventually branching  $\kappa$ -tree  $T$  such that  $T$  has a chain  $C$  of length  $\kappa$ , and prove that  $T$  has an antichain of size  $\kappa$ .

- We may assume that  $C$  is a branch, i.e. contains elements from each level of  $T$ .
- There exists a function  $f: C \rightarrow T$  such that  $t < f(t) \notin C$  for all  $t \in C$ .
- Now define  $\langle s_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle \in {}^\kappa C$  by recursion so that  $\text{ht}(s_\alpha) > \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \text{ht}(f(s_\beta))$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$ .
- Then  $\{f(s_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$  is an antichain of size  $\kappa$ . □

Suslin trees are closely related to Suslin lines, which occurred naturally in set theory (set theoretical topology) in connection with a possible weakening of a classical characterization of the real line  $(\mathbb{R}, <)$ . We need some definitions.

**Definition 16.** Let  $(L, <)$  be a linear order.

- We say that  $(L, <)$  is *densely ordered* (or briefly *dense*) if  $|L| > 1$  and for any  $a < b$  in  $L$  there exists  $c \in L$  such that  $a < c < b$ . A subset  $X$  of  $L$  is *dense in  $L$  (in the order sense)* if for any  $a < b$  in  $L$  there exists  $c \in X$  such that  $a < c < b$ .
- The subsets of  $L$  of the form  $(a, b) = \{x \in L : a < x < b\}$ ,  $(-\infty, b) = \{x \in L : x < b\}$ ,  $(a, \infty) = \{x \in L : a < x\}$  with  $a, b \in L$  are called *open intervals*. A subset  $U$  of  $L$  is called *open* if  $U = L$  or  $U$  is a union of open intervals.
- A subset  $D$  of  $L$  is *topologically dense in  $L$*  if  $D \cap U \neq \emptyset$  for every nonempty open subset  $U$  of  $L$ .
- $L$  is called *separable* if  $L$  has a countable subset which is topologically dense in  $L$ .
- An *antichain*<sup>2</sup> in  $L$  is a set of pairwise disjoint open subsets of  $L$ .
- $L$  is said to satisfy the *countable chain condition (ccc)* if every antichain in  $L$  is countable.

**Facts 17.** Let  $(L, <)$  be a linear order.

- (i) If  $L$  has a dense subset (in the order sense) and  $|L| > 1$ , then  $L$  is densely ordered.
- (ii) Every dense subset of  $L$  (in the order sense) is topologically dense in  $L$ .
- (iii) If  $L$  is densely ordered then, conversely, every topologically dense subset of  $L$  is dense in  $L$  (in the order sense).
- (iv) If  $L$  is separable, then  $L$  satisfies ccc.

**Theorem 18.** The following conditions on a linear order  $(L, <)$  are equivalent:

- (a)  $(L, <)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{R}, <)$ .
- (b)  $(L, <)$  has the following properties:
  - (†)  $L$  is densely ordered and has no least or greatest elements; moreover, in  $L$ , every nonempty subset that is bounded above has a least upper bound.
  - (‡)  $L$  is separable.

Suslin asked (1920) whether the separability condition (‡) in this theorem could be replaced by the condition that  $L$  has ccc. The assumption that the answer to this question is ‘yes’ is referred to as the “Suslin Hypothesis”.

**Theorem 19.** The following statements are equivalent (in ZFC):

- (a) There exists a linear order  $(S, <)$  such that
  - $(S, <)$  satisfies ccc, and
  - $(S, <)$  is not separable.
- (b) There exists a linear order  $(L, <)$  that is a counterexample to the Suslin Hypothesis.
- (c) There exists a linear order  $(L, <)$  such that
  - $(L, <)$  satisfies (†),
  - $(L, <)$  satisfies ccc, and
  - no nonempty open subset of  $(L, <)$  is separable.

---

<sup>2</sup>This notion is different from antichains as defined in Definition 1.

**Definition 20.** We will call a linear order  $(S, <)$  a *Suslin line*<sup>3</sup> if it satisfies the conditions in statement (a) of Theorem 19.

By Theorem 19, the Suslin Hypothesis can be restated as follows: *There is no Suslin line.*

**Theorem 21.** *The following statements are equivalent (in ZFC):*

- (a) *There exists a Suslin line.*
- (b) *There exists a Suslin tree.*

*Idea of Proof.* (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): We use a general construction that creates a ‘line’ (a linear order) from a tree.

- Given any tree  $(T, <)$  and any linear order  $\prec$  on  $T$  (unrelated to  $<$ ) we define a relation  $\triangleleft$  on the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of all branches of  $T$  as follows:
  - Note that since each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is a maximal chain in  $T$ , it contains a unique element  $b_\alpha^B$  of height  $\alpha$  for every  $\alpha < \text{len}(B)$  where  $\text{len}(B)$  is the length of  $B$ .
  - For any two distinct branches  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ , define  $B_1 \triangleleft B_2$  to hold iff  $b_\alpha^{B_1} \prec b_\alpha^{B_2}$  for the smallest ordinal  $\alpha < \min(\text{len}(B_1), \text{len}(B_2))$  such that  $b_\alpha^{B_1} \neq b_\alpha^{B_2}$ . (Such an  $\alpha$  exists, because  $B_1 \not\subseteq B_2$  and  $B_2 \not\subseteq B_1$ .)
- $(\mathcal{B}, \triangleleft)$  is a linear order.
- If  $(T, <)$  is a well-pruned Suslin tree and  $\prec$  is any linear order on  $T$ , then  $(\mathcal{B}, \triangleleft)$  is a Suslin line.

So, if there exists a Suslin tree, then by Theorem 14(i) and Facts 13(ii), there also exists a well-pruned Suslin tree, and the construction above yields a Suslin line.

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): Assume there exists a Suslin line. By Theorem 19, there exists a Suslin line  $(L, \prec)$  satisfying all conditions in part (c) of the theorem.<sup>4</sup> Let  $\mathbb{I}$  denote the set of all intervals  $(a, b)$  with  $a \prec b$  in  $L$ .

- One can define (by recursion) a system  $\langle \mathbb{J}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$  of nonempty subsets of  $\mathbb{I}$  with the following properties:
  - The elements of  $\mathbb{J}_\alpha$  are pairwise disjoint for every  $\alpha < \omega_1$ .
  - The sets  $\mathbb{J}_\alpha$  ( $\alpha < \omega_1$ ) are pairwise disjoint.
  - For  $T = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} \mathbb{J}_\alpha$ , the partially ordered set  $(T, \supset)$  is a tree with  $\text{Lev}_\alpha(T) = \mathbb{J}_\alpha$  for every  $\alpha < \omega_1$ .
  - If  $\gamma < \alpha < \omega_1$  and  $I \in \mathbb{J}_\gamma$ , then there are at least two  $J \in \mathbb{J}_\alpha$  such that  $I \supset J$ .
  - If  $\gamma < \alpha < \omega_1$  and  $I \in \mathbb{J}_\gamma$ ,  $J \in \mathbb{J}_\alpha$ , then either  $I \supset J$  or  $I \cap J = \emptyset$ .
- The last three items imply, respectively, the following:
  - $T$  has height  $\omega_1$ .
  - $T$  is eventually branching.
  - Every antichain (in the sense of Definition 1) in  $T$  is an antichain (in the sense of Definition 16) in the Suslin line  $(L, \prec)$ . Since  $L$  satisfies ccc, every antichain in  $T$  is countable.

It follows from Theorem 15 that  $T$  is a Suslin tree. □

<sup>3</sup>A Suslin line is often defined as a linear order that is a counterexample to the Suslin Hypothesis. This definition is not equivalent to our definition. Only the existence of the two kinds of Suslin lines is equivalent.

<sup>4</sup>Actually, the completeness property in the second line of  $(\dagger)$  is not used in the construction.